

✓
PHILOSOPHY,
RELIGION AND
EDUCATION

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS



A Christian Journal of Opinion

The Dismal Prospects for Disarmament

All prophecies are dangerous, and only a fool will hazard them. Sometimes, however, probabilities are so obvious that one is tempted to run the risk of being a fool. This is such a time, and the disarmament negotiations are the occasion.

Despite Mr. Stassen's continued (and probably professional) optimism and the qualified optimism of our Administration, the disarmament negotiations are bound to fail. They will fail even though the President has made a new offer to postpone nuclear tests for two years, provided some of our conditions are met. The negotiations have been carried on so long partly because each side genuinely desires release from the mounting armaments burden and partly because neither side wants to give the other side the propaganda advantage by breaking them off.

Nevertheless, there is an *a priori* reason for predicting the ultimate failure of the negotiations. It is that international tensions are not mitigated by disarmament, but disarmament is made possible by the relaxation of tensions. The disarmament enthusiasts have argued for years that disarmament is the egg which grows into the chicken of relaxation. But there is no evidence to prove the point. There is much evidence to prove that there must be some steps betokening growing mutual trust before the next step of disarmament can be taken.

This general principle can be validated in terms of the present situation in all the details. The Russians have consistently insisted on the destruction of atomic weapons. We have consistently replied that this would not be possible without an adequate inspection system. It was when the Russians accepted a modified inspection system a

few months ago that hopes really began to rise, though we were still far apart on the extent to which territory on both sides was to be subject to aerial inspection. The announcement by the Russians that they now have the intercontinental ballistic missile, whether operative or not, indicates their true intent on disarmament.

Since our abandonment of the ultimate weapon, the only hope of deterrence, would be unthinkable and politically impossible without a fool-proof system, this alone is a very great hazard. One wonders whether the Congress would ever sanction an agreement which would rob us of the ultimate weapon when we are probably inferior to the Russians in conventional military power. And despite our protestations and disillusionments after Hungary, we are probably also at a disadvantage ideologically, at least on the dark continents. This does not mean that our only defense is the dreaded bomb. It means that the power of its deterrence gives us time to perfect our ideological and military defenses all over the world where the Russian power is probing and pressing. But this consideration applies only to us and not to the Russians.

A further reason for being pessimistic about the negotiations is that both sides have made either strategic or political demands which the other side cannot possibly meet as preconditions for an accord. The Russians are demanding that both sides withdraw their troops from Europe. This seemingly equilateral proposal would mean that we abandon Europe to the near neighbor while we withdraw for thousands of miles. One only has to look at any global map to recognize how impossible this proposal is.

Vol. XVII, No. 15 September 16, 1957 \$3.00 per year; 15 cents per copy

We, on the other hand, have made the unification of Germany, with guaranteed free elections, the *sine qua non* of an agreement. The Russians could not possibly grant this condition. They would lose East Germany under the proposal and they desperately need it both for industrial and strategic reasons. In other words, both sides are prompted by their fears of being worsted in a disarmament agreement to make conditions which would prevent the agreement from being one-sided according to their viewpoint. But the conditions cannot be accepted by the other side because the present expenditure for armaments is preferable to the risk involved in an agreement.

If these pessimistic conclusions should be valid, for what can we hope either in terms of German unification or of peace? German unification is not impossible, but it can only come by the gradual attraction of West Germany to the people of East Germany, who are still fleeing across the boundary at the rate of over a thousand a month. The prosperity of West Germany under conditions of freedom is a more potent strategic weapon than any available to us.

In short, nothing in sight promises relief from the burden which we have assumed and which may be on our shoulders for decades. The only consolation is the reflection that these very burdens, so difficult to bear, are a means of grace to a wealthy nation which might become unbearable to itself and to its neighbors without the discipline of these responsibilities. But this is preaching, and we started out to gauge the success and predict the failure of the disarmament conference.

R.N.

VICTORY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

AS WE go to press it seems that the final action of Congress will be a much greater victory for civil rights than was thought possible at the height of the debate. We heard much about the skill and effectiveness of the southern strategists in shaping the legislation according to their own desires, but now, in spite of their efforts, they have to accept a law which will give the federal government real power to safeguard the voting rights of Negroes in the South.

The southern opponents of all advances in this area were helped at the outset by the fact that the original bill that came from the House to the Senate went too far. It was sound for the Senate to make

a distinction between the right to vote and integration of the schools. Federal coercion can establish the right to vote without interfering with a great variety of human relationships such as those involved in public education. Legal force that comes wholly from outside the local situation is not a good instrument for solving educational problems. This does not mean that law has no place here, but it must be law that has considerable local support. Federal action may then be necessary to help a community deal with local lawbreakers or fomenters of violence, as in Clinton, Tennessee, but in that case there was general local support for the law. This support may be little more than the acceptance of law as law, but even when this is all that is emphasized, there may well be some recognition that the law is right even though it is unwelcome. Without such minimum support for law within the situation it is doubtful if direct federal action affecting children and parents and the quality of education would be advisable. For many this judgment will be hard to take, but we are up against limits as to what purely external coercion can accomplish. But there are not limits of this kind in connection with the securing of the right to vote.

During most of the debate about the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill, the issues were obscured by the highly technical distinction, between civil and criminal contempt, and the layman in these matters was again led to think for some time that all had been lost for civil rights when the jury trial amendment was adopted, that nothing remained of the bill but a useless gesture. Second thoughts have led to a recognition that civil contempt which enables a judge to keep election officials in jail until they comply with the order of the court provides the federal government with real power. Now the compromise bill which has come out of negotiations between House and Senate provides for criminal contempt action without jury trial with a jail sentence limited to forty-five days. This extends the power of the court to secure obedience to its orders without running the risk of setting up a judicial tyranny such as that which gave some substance to the fears of those who supported the jury trial amendment.

This whole experience illustrates how questions of basic moral principle are interwoven with technical questions about which very few persons are competent to form an opinion. One can sympathize with the senators and congressmen who had to face

rapidly changing dilemmas without the chance to know very clearly what was involved and yet were under the necessity of voting.

J.C.B.

PROGRESS IN NASHVILLE

WHILE CONGRESS debated civil rights, a large southern city, Nashville, Tennessee, was about to put into effect a plan for gradual integration of the schools. This Nashville plan differs from the plan that was put into effect in Louisville. Louisville integrated all grades at once; Nashville is integrating gradually beginning with the first grade. Great credit should go to the many civic leaders and school administrators who have had the courage and the patience to work through all of the problems involved in such a step in the face of opposition.

It will be very important to compare the results of these two methods. There is much to be said educationally for the gradual method if there is great disparity between the two school systems.

With the children of both races receiving the same education from the beginning a community can prevent any group of children from being held back by those whose previous training has been inferior, but this will not be much gain unless the general quality of education in the new system is on a high level. In this respect the problem is not so much racial as it is a problem of insufficient resources for handling the numbers which most large communities face.

There is one very wise provision in the Nashville plan which purists, who are not willing to limit the use of coercion in realizing their ideal, may condemn as an opportunity for evasion. Parents who do not want their children to be educated in a school in which they would be in a racial minority may petition for transfer to another school. Louisville also permitted this kind of transfer. The provision of this safety valve can do a great deal to undercut the most stubborn opposition to desegregation without preventing a major step forward.

J.C.B.

Protestantism, Catholicism and POAU

TOM G. SANDERS

PROTESTANTS AND Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (POAU), now entering its tenth year, has taken its place in American life as an expression of social concern. POAU's efforts have been centered particularly against attempts by the Roman Catholic Church to secure direct or indirect public financial aid for parochial schools and charitable institutions, to censor literature or communications, to achieve the appointment of a representative to the Vatican, and to maintain members of Catholic religious orders as teachers in public schools.

In addition, POAU has criticized restrictions against any religious groups where a privileged church exists, as well as repression of Protestant public expression in Spain, Italy and certain Latin American countries. POAU deserves credit for alerting people to Catholic legal violations in the United States and attacks on human dignity in other countries where this zealous church sometimes expresses itself by use of political instruments and violence.

The Roman Catholic Church is an enigma and a threat to Protestantism. Possessed of a self-confidence and unity that Protestants usually cannot match, Catholicism has contributed to a cultural alteration of many parts of this country which were once Protestant strongholds. Where they have gained a majority, Catholics have often acted ungenerously and illegally by such measures as voting inadequate funds to public schools, purchasing abandoned schools at ridiculous prices, making arrangements whereby parochial schools are rented or supported by municipal authorities, boycotting communications in the community, or intimidating anyone critical of these procedures. Firm non-Catholic resistance has often countered such actions, but at times recourse to the courts has been necessary.

Catholicism remains a spectre haunting Protestants who see in its aggressive proselytizing, high birth rate and ability to take advantage of opportunities a potential replacement of the "American way of life" by that of certain countries both Catholic and dictatorial. Protestant anxiety is not eased by a perusal of the comments of popes and

Mr. Sanders is a member of the religion department at Sweet Briar College in Virginia.

Catholic theologians about an ideal church-state relationship consisting in a union of the two. Frequently, statements of prelates appear in which "freedom" and "separation of church and state" are criticized in a manner that arouses venom in the Protestant American heart.

Differing Protestant Attitudes

Many American Protestants have, nevertheless, declined to associate themselves with POAU, questioning its legitimacy as an instrument of Protestant opinion on the church-state issue. They agree with POAU on opposition to obvious legal or illegal pressure by the Catholic Church to gain special privileges, since recognizing that inordinate demands by any group in a pluralistic society are not healthful and should be criticized. But critical Protestants cannot accept certain assumptions and methods of POAU policy.

In characterizing the viewpoint of POAU, caution is essential. It must be recognized that such an extensive organization counts among its members, on the one hand, sincere people who are genuinely, and without bias, concerned about Catholic actions in their communities and, at the opposite extreme, individuals who stand within the tradition of the 19th century nativism and who have associated themselves with POAU to express prejudices that would be deplored by many other members. A basic source, however, for determining the POAU position would seem to be its monthly magazine, *Church and State*.

The major difference between the Protestants inside and those outside POAU is the definition of "separation" of church and state. (This split was manifested after the McCollum Case in 1948. This decision concerning released-time religious education was hailed by POAU and many Protestants as a landmark in the preservation of freedom of religion, but was also criticized by twenty-seven Protestant churchmen and theologians in *Christianity and Crisis*, July 5, 1948, as a dangerous departure from the traditional American understanding of the relationship between church and state. There was, then, no Protestant unanimity on this issue.) That POAU has never clearly defined "separation" is advantageous in polemic but is also exemplary of loose thinking. Nevertheless, there are indications of the organization's position, since it has espoused vigorously the Jeffersonian metaphor, appearing as dictum in the Everson School Bus Case, of the "wall between church and state."

In America, however, there has never been a

"wall" between the political and religious orders. One need only cite examples of federal and state support given to religion through tax exemption, support of chaplains, deferment of ministers and pacifists from military service, and days of thanksgiving. In times past these benefits were even more extensive, but in recent years the Supreme Court has tended to limit more sharply the extent of cooperation between government and religion. In the United States, however, unlike some European countries, separation has implied a policy of non-interfering cooperation and mutual support rather than strict separation. POAU has been strangely silent about rescinding benefits which Protestants have extensively shared because of the traditionally harmonious relation between church and state in the United States.

Furthermore, POAU does not define separation by existing legislation, for a large part of its legal effort is devoted to opposing state laws permitting coordinate relations between parochial schools and local communities, teaching by members of religious orders in the public schools, and federal provisions for public payment of textbook and transportation costs in private schools. Can it be that POAU does not actively oppose laws that predominantly favor Protestants and does oppose those from which Catholics derive the greater benefit? To impute such a charge to POAU might be unfair, but this appears to be its present position. If so, this does not imply a "wall" of separation between church and state.

Let us assume, on the other hand, that the "wall" metaphor is to be taken seriously and that POAU would like to see an absolute distinction between the two spheres. *Church and State* has featured many quotations from Jefferson and Madison to support such a position. The authority of Jefferson and Madison is, however, not a complete solution to the problem of defining "separation." The particular ecclesiastical notions of these founding fathers can scarcely be absolutized into constitutional law. The Constitution itself is not explicit on this matter, but merely permits the freedom to function religiously when this does not endanger public order and forbids a legal establishment of religion. Subsequent judicial decisions have not indicated a "wall" of separation but have determined with considerable ambiguity the limits within which cooperation may occur. The first step, therefore, that POAU might take to gain further support would be to clarify what it means by "separation" and to relinquish the inappropriate metaphor of the "wall." By remaining vague, POAU has been

able to lift Catholic statements defining separation from their context and use them unfairly as weapons.

The School Problem

Whereas POAU opposes existing laws granting indirect aid to parochial school pupils, some other Protestants think that the prosperity of religion in America has been as much the result of the moral support of government as it has been the result of the distinction explicit in separation and that under no conditions should the present cooperation be diminished. The latter view accepts secondary aid in its present form as permissible on grounds of general welfare apart from sectarian considerations. Although total government support of parochial schools might lead to a disastrous fragmentation of the American educational system, thoughtful Protestants can see an element of justice in the Catholic complaint that in exercising religious freedom they undergo discrimination by being compelled to pay a double educational ticket. For Catholics, education without the Catholic faith as a focus is inadequate. Protestants should be willing to explore means of providing further indirect aid to parochial schools.

Church and State has continually advocated the secular public school as the solution to our problem of religious pluralism. The public school has many virtues; one of the most significant has been its inculcation of religious and moral values corresponding to the Protestant ethos of earlier periods of American history. It was, in fact, this Protestant atmosphere, expressed in reading the King James Version of the Bible and reciting the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer, that was a major impulse in driving Catholics to establish their own schools where they would be free to provide a religiously centered education more to their liking.

As public schools in recent years have grown more secular, many Protestants (and Catholics) have feared that the "faith in democracy" taught there has become inimical to true religion. The result has been a movement toward establishing Protestant parochial schools, based on the conviction that education is idolatrous without an orientation in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. (This problem has not, of course, arisen in areas like the South, where the public schools are essentially Protestant.) The ironic element in the POAU position is that as it presses for its panacea, the secularized school, it is arousing among Prot-

estants increased consternation that may in time lead to the destruction of the public schools because they will have become intolerable even to Protestants.

Rather than proceeding inexorably toward a "non-religious" public school system, where a counter-religion of secularism is covertly substituted for our Judaeo-Christian heritage, a far more creative Protestant strategy, one more in accord with American tradition, would be an exploration of the means by which the Judaeo-Christian faith underlying American history might be incorporated into the public schools within the limits of recent judicial decisions. Such an enterprise is not enhanced by attacks on existing, constitutionally valid legislation permitting public support of religion, even if the principal beneficiaries happen to be Catholics. A supposedly non-religious school may be justifiable to a secularist, but it is antagonistic to a Protestant philosophy of education. Protestantism expresses itself best in a society where government is not hostile but appreciative of religion and where religion is not, conversely, relegated to the altar but exercises an indirect influence on economic, social and political institutions.

Questionable Tactics

A totally inexcusable element in POAU literature is its deliberate attempt to make the Catholic position look as incompatible with democracy as possible. To quote the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII or the statements of conservative periodicals like *The Brooklyn Tablet* or *The American Ecclesiastical Review* is one thing; to grasp the thought and performance of Roman Catholicism in America is another. It is incorrect to regard the Catholic Church either as a monolithic monster or an espionage agency directed by the Pope to subvert American democracy. But this is the impression one receives from *Church and State* or some of POAU's experts, like Paul Blanshard. Catholicism is better understood as a body with virtual unanimity on matters of religious faith, somewhat less on morals, and on other issues, including politics, hectic disagreement.

The common unfair tactic of POAU is to quote out of context the most disagreeable statement obtainable and present it as the universal Catholic position. Little attention is given to more tolerable views within the church. Nor does POAU apparently realize that the Pope does not make infallible pronouncements on every issue, that one of the astonishing things about Catholic

authority is the considerable room left for further individual interpretation. In the Catholic system, furthermore, one of the least clearly defined areas is the authority of the hierarchy; an episcopal announcement does not automatically bind the diocese to obedience, and many disregard admonitions they consider imprudent.

Again, to quote a principle of Catholic moral philosophy is not as significant as POAU would like to think, for in Thomist ethics application in an historical situation involves considerable modification of the original principle. Another dubious procedure is to extract Catholic theological concepts, like freedom and conscience, and imply that they are the official Catholic position toward the American notions of freedom and conscience. These theological concepts are highly complex, but they are theological and not political. There is no American prelate or theologian writing today who does not subscribe heartily to the American expression of freedom of religion and conscience in the First Amendment. In fact, Catholics are obligated to support this existing constitutional structure; to do otherwise is a sin.

The most questionable action of POAU is its failure to accord to the Catholic Church sincerity in its religious mission. There are many variations of the theme that it is only a power organization working for the enslavement of the minds and pocketbooks of mankind. One approach is to set the priest and laymen against each other and look upon the latter as integers driven by clerical machinations. Another is to ascribe to Catholic "pressure" any unfavorable development for POAU. For example, when sincere citizens, including Protestants, banned *The Nation* from the New York public schools because they felt Blanshard's articles on Catholic influence were misleading and biased, they were accused by POAU of having succumbed to "pressure." Equally inadmissible is the old argument that Catholics cannot be loyal Americans because they are subject to a foreign power. One could at least hope for consistency here. In the controversy over an ambassador to the Vatican, POAU claimed that the Pope was not a political, but a religious leader. Today, on issues like the granting of licenses to Jesuit TV stations, the Pope is not a religious, but a political figure. This is a direct attack on the Catholic religion, for a basic tenet of Catholic faith is the spiritual and moral, but not political, leadership of the Pope.

Finally, POAU's blinders prevent it from seeing variations in church-state relations throughout

the world. While Catholicism predominates in Spain and other dictatorships, it also has the majority in Eire, Belgium and West Germany. Such examples should relieve Protestant anxiety about a Catholic majority. POAU denounces established churches in non-Catholic countries, but by absolutizing the American situation, it fails to see that just and harmonious solutions have been reached elsewhere through quite different juridical expressions.

Suggested Policy Towards Catholicism

It seems, then, that many POAU attitudes can only be explained as the product of an anti-Catholic animus that more sober Protestants would like to avoid. Furthermore, an absolutized notion of separation does not leave the Protestant free to make discriminating judgments on issues where, at times, he would support POAU in opposition to Catholic policy and, at other times, he would be fully on the Catholic side. Protestantism is not essentially "anti-Catholic." Rather than looking for the worst in Catholicism to feed the underlying prejudice and paranoia, Protestants should appreciate the encouraging adjustment Catholicism has made in the United States and comprehend the additional problems faced by Catholics in relating the teaching of their church, often obscured by its application to other political situations, to modern pluralistic democracy.

There are real areas of conflict when Catholic interpretations of natural law contradict American tradition, or when Catholics simply overstep their bounds. At such points, Protestants must stand for what they believe in the forum that constitutes democracy, but they must also be sufficiently self-critical to see the distortions taking place in the home camp. To label as "Protestant" a notion of separation incompatible with any Protestant ethic and to pervert the canons of objectivity by the use of unfair tactics are a more serious threat to the integrity of Protestantism than present Catholic actions.

In Our Next Issue

ROBERT McAFEE BROWN discusses Albert Camus' recent novel, *The Fall*, and its implications for Christian faith.

"*The Fall* gives us the portrait of a 'modern man' who is making a kind of secular confessional. . . . We hear the story of a man's fall, but . . . this is not just the fall of a man, but in reality the fall of man. . . ."

SPECIAL REPORT

BILLY GRAHAM IN NEW YORK—II'

The result of the Madison Square Garden bout between Billy Graham and Beelzebub is, as of the moment, inconclusive. For fifteen weeks, impressive crowds have come out nightly to watch the contest and affirm their loyalty to the North Carolina devil-chaser. His adversary has not been seen, but his presence has been detected on many occasions. "I keep a diary and I'm writing every way Satan has attacked this crusade," Graham told his New York hearers. "I have to admit he's done a lot to hurt it." Every time a message is directed against the devil, continued Billy, "his Satanic majesty has tried to hamper my delivery."

To be sure, some have found Graham's delivery displeasing: a 45-minute, rapid-fire barrage in accusatorial tones. Much more controversial, however, has been his content. His use of stereotyped fundamentalist terms and ideology has disturbed many. While disclaiming emotionalism, one of Billy's favorite techniques is to scare people into salvation. "Prepare to meet thy God," he cries out. "Especially the people of New York. One hydrogen bomb, and you're done." His exploitation of superlatives is likewise offensive. Everything is "more" or "most," "largest" or "biggest," and "best." Most annoying of all, perhaps, is his inexcusable verbatim repetition of phrases, entire paragraphs, stories, and even jokes.

In spite of these and other characteristics, the people have come—many of them day after day, toting their Bibles and special hymn books. As the crusade entered its final week, attendance for ninety-one nights was 1,703,700 with a gigantic Times Square rally still ahead. Of these, 51,898 had "registered their decisions for Christ." These figures do not paint the entire picture to date, as on very few nights has the Garden been filled to capacity, and it is difficult to believe Graham's oft-repeated statement that the crowds far exceed his wildest expectations. Nevertheless, the crusade is numerically a success, and even more impressive is the loyalty and sacrifice of Graham's followers. Thousands of choir members, counselors, and ushers have appeared faithfully each evening and their enthusiasm has increased as the weeks passed by and their customary summer pleasures were set aside.

Many observers have suggested the most obvious explanations for this phenomenon! Billy is a fine fellow—sincere, decent, and photogenic. To most, his delivery is compelling. His message is simple. He tells Bible stories with color and zest. He is aided by an effective team. Probably soloist Bev Shea is his most popular colleague. Cliff Barrows, the choir director and the show's MC, is efficient, versatile, hard-working, but too saccharine for

some. Others, including many behind the scenes, perform their tasks ably. They are assisted by the general upsurge in religious interest, the cooperation of more than 1500 churches, bus loads each evening from outlying areas, the frequent appearance of celebrities (such as Nixon at the Yankee Stadium meeting), and a massive publicity build-up which has included daily radio and television programs, and an hour-long, coast-to-coast TV hookup Saturday evenings.

Certainly the response of the local press has been a vital factor in inspiring large and sympathetic crowds. Innumerable stories have been blown up to warrant wide coverage: Graham is willing to lead a revival in Russia; Graham conducts a service for the Spanish-speaking; Graham says hell is a lonely place; Graham battles against teenage crime; Graham forgives a former liquor salesman who poses as an usher and walks away with \$500.19; etc. As anticipated, the *Daily News* and Hearst's two dailies have given the evangelist considerable attention. The *Times* solemnly published the complete text of Billy's opening sermon at the Garden. New York's two newspapers oriented toward the white Protestant business community have gone much further. The *Herald Tribune* runs a daily "Billy Graham Says" feature, while the afternoon *World-Telegram and Sun* has regularly provided its readers with lengthy excerpts from his sermon of the previous night. Only the *Post*, circulated primarily among Jews, has given the evangelist scant notice. The sole critic of the crusade in the local press has been a *Post* columnist, the incisive, free-wheeling Murray Kempton.

Billy's authoritarianism also helps explain the large number who return night after night. In spite of his well-publicized modesty, Graham fits the part of a God-sent messenger confidently leading his flock in a desperate battle against sin. Early in the evening program—and repeated again before the meeting closes—are his stern admonitions that it is "your duty and responsibility as Christians" to attend every meeting. A similar firmness is evident throughout the message. He invariably begins each sermon with the same words: "I'm going to ask that we bow our heads in prayer. Every head bowed. Every eye closed. During the prayer, I'm going to ask that there be no walking around. . . . Every one is here by divine appointment. . . . I'm going to give this message directed by the spirit of God." The tenor of his invitation is the same: "I'm going to ask that not a person leave the building. I'm going to ask hundreds of you to come down from the balconies. I know it will take courage. . . . Tonight I'm asking you to take a step of faith. . . . I'm going to wait for you." Evident in such words are the direction and decisiveness that have always made authoritarianisms appeal. Combined with it is a willingness to be a martyr. Amid loud sobbing, one night Graham made reference to his exhaustion, adding: "But I'm willing to give my life, ready to die in New York to see a true spiritual revival in New York and America."

¹ This is our second report on Billy Graham's New York Crusade. The reporter, Ralph Lord Roy, is author of *Apostles of Discord* and is now with the *Fund for the Republic*.

Another reason for the constant large crowds at the Garden has been increased Negro enthusiasm. Considerable Negro church leadership of the city greeted Graham with skepticism because of the widespread belief that he was backward on the color question. Heavy pressure from clergymen who knew the local situation finally led to bold steps toward reconciliation with these dissatisfied Negro spokesmen. Care was taken to invite them to participate in the program. Graham made special visits to Harlem and Brooklyn's Negro community where he denounced racism in open-air meetings. A young Negro evangelist was added to the previously all-white team. Ethel Waters was given a prominent role in the crusade's musical program, including two nation-wide television appearances. Much of the remaining opposition was stilled when Graham publicly endorsed civil rights legislation and introduced Martin Luther King, Jr., to the Garden crowd. Graham described King as a leader in "a great social revolution," while King complimented his host for refusing to hold segregated meetings. Each of these events spurred Negro attendance.

How can anyone adequately evaluate the Madison Square Garden spectacle? Some observers have found it easy to praise or damn, occasionally with an air of dogmatism that is reminiscent of religious acrimony of past decades. The effects of the campaign will be largely written upon the minds and hearts of those who attend, and especially of those who dedicate themselves, for the first or the tenth time, to Christian faith and life. Perhaps no study, however enterprising, could properly weigh the long-term impact of these experiences. Maybe, as Graham says, only in ten years will the seeds planted now be ready for the harvest.

Personally I find little in Graham's message or manner that appeals. As the crusade has progressed, my boredom has increased a hundred-fold. It is difficult to understand why he has made such a dent on America's religious life. Obviously, a well-oiled propaganda machine is in large part responsible for the image that has been created. Yet, a machine may succeed in attracting thousands once, but only some form of satisfaction could bring them back again and again.

Most of the dangers in Graham's New York encounter have been pointed out by the critics already. Some antagonists of religion—among them a group of intellectuals—may have their prejudices against the church strengthened. But should we

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving Dept.
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-57

be embarrassed (as many of us are) when they refuse to make any honest effort to discover and appreciate the many diverse expressions of modern Protestantism? Certainly, enough ministers in the city have publicly assailed Graham to make serious people aware that he speaks for only one interpretation of the biblical faith.

A greater danger may stem from attempts of fundamentalists to seize the leadership in the post-crusade follow-up. There may be some truth, too, in the arguments that Graham causes psychological chaos, creates dissatisfaction with local clergymen who are not endowed with his dynamism, offers shallow solutions to life's complicated problems and avoids or deals superficially with the key social problems of our day.

Other factors may balance the scales. Thousands are hungry for some certainty in this era of shattered altars. Graham is providing this certainty and with it new purpose and hope. We all know enough elderly men and women who lead lonely, unhappy lives to keep from scoffing at their daily sacrifices to attend the Garden meetings. We know, too, of youth—robbed of many idealistic causes of the past—who seek in religion an outlet for their selfless dedication and boundless energy. Meanwhile, Protestantism is demonstrating in New York that it cannot be overlooked as a potent force. This is no minor accomplishment.

It is indeed unfortunate that the evangelist filling Madison Square Garden is not some clairvoyant intellectual giant, equipped to discuss Christianity's complexities, ambiguities, and paradoxes. As has been suggested many times before, Graham's success is our failure. Rather than sit back and cry havoc, we should sit up and take notice.

RALPH LORD ROY

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ARNOLD W. HEARN, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

FRANCIS P. MILLER J. OSCAR LEE
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER
HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

PROTESTANTISM, CATHOLICISM AND POAU TOM G. SANDERS
BILLY GRAHAM IN NEW YORK—II RALPH LORD ROY